

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/795,807	03/08/2004	Salar Arta Kamangar	Google-40APP (GP-092-00-U	7711	
Straub & Poke	7590 10/28/20 stylo	10	EXAMINER		
788 Shrewsbu	ry Avenue		LASTRA, DANIEL		
Tinton Falls, N	J 07724		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3688		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/28/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/795,807	KAMANGAR ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
DANIEL LASTRA	3688		

	DANIEL LASTRA	3000	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 12 October 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
 X he reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date 	of the final rejection.		
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (a) or (b).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(I Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		36(a) and the annronriat	e extension fee
Laterisons of time in any be doubland on John 19 of the period of ext have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the second sec	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belover).	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Nation of Non Co.	mpliant Amandment (DTOL 224)
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		inpliant Amendment (i	F TOL-324).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: 		I be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13. Other:	,		

/DANIEL LASTRA/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3688

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that Angles does not anticipate claims 17-20 and 50-3 because according to the Applicant, Angles does not teach at least two of a first ad network, second ad network, first ad agency and a second ad agency and the at least one ad originates from an advertiser, wherein the advertiser is different from the proxy and the content provider. The Examiner answers that Angles teaches that the advertisement provider (see figure 4, item 18) functions as a proxy representing a plurality of advertisers (i.e. ad agencies) and where at least one ad originates from an advertiser that pays for advertising directed at specific demographic target groups and where said advertiser is billed based on actual delivery of the ad to pertinent consumers (see col 4, lines 1-5). An ad agency represents an advertiser and therefore, can be construed to be an advertiser. Therefore, contrary to Applicant's argument. Angles anticipates Applicant's claimed invention. The Applicant argues with respect to claim 21 that Patel does not teach Applicant's claimed invention because the exchange system of Patel does not multicast advertiser offers to publishers. The Examiner answers that Patel teaches that advertisers are able to instantly submit for viewing by all publishers any number of offers on the exchange system (see paragraph 51). Therefore, contrary to Applicant's argument. Patel teaches multicasting advertisers The Applicant argues with respect to claims 1-16 and 34-49 that the cable show of Eldering is not a pageview and is not broadcast in response to a page request. The Examiner answers that Eldering teaches a pageview in response to a page request (see col 12, lines 9-32). Therefore, contrary to Applicant's argument, Eldering teaches Applicant's claimed limitation. The Applicant argues that in the device of Detering, since the information needed to generate bids is already stored, the device has no need to multicast request for bids to a plurality of advertisers. The Examiner answers that the Eldering reference was used to teach the multicasting limitation.